REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to

impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention,

rather than to avoid prior art.

Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 1-46 under the judicially created doctrine of

double patenting over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent 5,583,984. A terminal disclaimer

is included to overcome this rejection.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the title because it is not descriptive. The title

has been amended to reflect the Examiner's suggestion.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly

claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims

have been amended to correct the antecedent basis.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,347,628 (hereinafter "Brewer").

Claim 1, as amended, includes a limitation of temporary window logic,

coupled to a display and an input device, that opens a temporary window for a

particular enclosure within an opened enclosure to display identifiers within the

18

Appl. No. 09/964,723 Amdt. dated 10/18/2004 temporary window corresponding to objects enclosed by the particular enclosure, in response to a movement of a selected object over an identifier corresponding to the particular enclosure. Brewer does not disclose the cited limitation. As a result, claim 1 is not anticipated by Brewer.

Specifically, Brewer discloses a computer system for displaying a control window including a perspective view of a work area (see Abstract). When a user selects a drawer with a cursor, and drags the drawer, the drawer is pulled to a partially opened position (Col. 3, lines 62-67). Movement of the drawer to the partially opened position causes a window to be displayed in a different location on a display screen (Col. 4, lines 1-7).

Brewer does not disclose that the drawer opens (and the window is displayed) in response to a movement of a *selected object* over an identifier corresponding to a particular enclosure, which is within an opened enclosure, as in claim 1. Instead, a user drags the drawer open. The cursor used to open the drawer may be used to manipulate icons on the screen (Col. 3, lines 54-61), but a user can only open the drawer when the cursor is not manipulating an icon. As a result, Brewer does not disclose the cited limitation of claim 1, and does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 1. Since claim 1 is not anticipated by Brewer, claim 7 is also not anticipated by Brewer.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 2, 11, 13, 18, 20, 26 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent 5,347,628 (hereinafter "Brewer") in view of IBM TDB Vol. 35 No. 4B September 1993 (hereinafter "IBM TDB").

Appl. No. 09/964,723 Amdt. dated 10/18/2004 Reply to Office action of June 16, 2004 Independent claim 18 includes a limitation of temporary window opening logic that opens a current temporary window for a particular enclosure within an opened enclosure to display identifiers within the current temporary window corresponding to objects enclosed by the particular enclosure, in response to a movement of a selected object over an identifier corresponding to the particular enclosure. Neither Brewer nor IBM TDB disclose such a limitation. As a result, claim 18 is patentable over Brewer and IBM.

Specifically, as mentioned above, Brewer discloses only that a drawer may be opened by selecting and dragging the drawer, and not that a current temporary window is opened in response to a movement of a selected object over an identifier corresponding to a particular enclosure. Therefore, Brewer does not disclose the cited limitation.

IBM TDB discloses only that inactive windows are automatically reduced to icons, and that a window may be opened by moving a mouse pointer over a desired icon. However, IBM TDB discloses only that a mouse pointer activates the inactive window, and not that a temporary window is opened in response to a movement of a selected object over an identifier corresponding to a particular enclosure. As a result, neither Brewer nor IBM TDB disclose the cited limitation of claim 18, and claim 18 is patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

Claims 20, 26, and 30 depend from claim 18, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 18. Since claim 18 is patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB, claims 20, 26, and 30 are also patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

Claims 2, 11 and 13 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1. IBM TDB does not disclose the limitation discussed above

20

regarding claim 1. As a result, claims 2, 11 and 13 are patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

by Brewer in view of U.S. Patent 5,5,305,425 (hereinafter "Bronson"). Claim 3

depends from claim 1, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 1.

Bronson does not disclose the cited limitation discussed above regarding claim 1.

As a result, claim 3 is patentable over Brewer and Bronson.

Examiner rejected claims 4-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable by Brewer. Claims 4-6 and 8 depend from claim 1, and therefore

include all the limitations of claim 1. Since claim 1 is not anticipated by Brewer,

claims 4-6 and 8 are patentable over Brewer.

Examiner rejected claims 23, 24 and 25 are in the same context as claim 6, 7

and 8; therefore were rejected under similar rationale. Claims 23, 24, and 25

depend from claim 18, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 18. Since

claim 18 is patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB, claims 23, 24, and 25 are also

patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

by Brewer in view of IBM TDB. Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and therefore

includes all the limitations of claim 1. As mentioned above, IBM TDB does not

disclose the cited limitation of claim 1 discussed above. As a result, claim 10 is

patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

21

Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Brewer in view of IBM TDB. Claim 27 depends from claim 18, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 18. Since claim 18 is patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB, claim 27 is also patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

Independent claim 33 includes a limitation of temporary window opening logic that opens a current temporary window for a particular enclosure within an opened enclosure to display identifiers within the current temporary window corresponding to objects enclosed by the particular enclosure, in response to a movement of the selected object over an identifier corresponding to the particular enclosure. Neither Brewer nor IBM TDB disclose such a limitation. As a result, claim 33 is patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

Specifically, as mentioned above, Brewer discloses only that a drawer may be opened by selecting and dragging it. Further, as also mentioned above, IBM TDB only discloses that inactive windows are minimized to icons, and that windows may be opened by moving a cursor over them. As a result, neither Brewer nor IBM TDB discloses the cited limitation, and claim 33 is patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

Claims 34-46 depend from claim 33, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 33. Since claim 33 is patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB, claims 34-46 are also patentable over Brewer and IBM TDB.

22

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Arlen M. Hartounian at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 10/18/04

Arlen M. Hartounian

Reg. No. 52,997

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 (408) 720-8300